REMARKS

Applicants have canceled claims 1-24 during prosecution of this patent application. Applicants are not conceding in this patent application that said canceled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, since the claim cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue said canceled claims, and other claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

The Examiner objected to the drawings.

The Examiner objected to claims 2 and 13.

The Examiner rejected claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 13-18 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Mumick et al. (US 6983307 B2).

The Examiner rejected claims 10-11 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mumick et al. (US 6983307 B2) in view of Masse et al. (US 5596721).

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mumick et al. (US 6983307 B2) in view of Balasuriya (US 2003/0140113 A1).

Applicants respectfully traverse the drawings objection, the claim objections, and the § 101, § 102 and § 103 rejections, with the following arguments.

Drawings Objection

The Examiner objected to the drawings (Figure 2).

The Examiner argues: "Figure 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated."

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that FIG. 2 is not prior art, but rather is a data processing system 130 comprising memory 136 that contains application programs and data used in accordance with embodiments of the present invention.

FIG. 3 depicts memory 136 of FIG. 2 in more detail. More specifically, FIG. 3 shows that memory 136 comprises application programs 254 that implement embodiments of the present invention (see specification, page 12, lines 7-10). Moreover, application programs 254 comprises navigation module 260, as well as context data 262 and identifiers 264, in accordance with embodiments of the present invention (see specification, page 12, lines 13-16).

Since memory 136, as depicted in FIGS. 2 and 3 and described in the specification, comprises application programs, context data, and identifiers used in accordance with embodiments of the present invention, Applicants maintain that FIG. 2 is not prior art and should not be labeled as prior art.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to FIG. 2 be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 2 and 13.

Since claims 2 and 13 have been canceled, the objection to claims 2 and 13 is moot.

35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Since claims 23 and 24 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is moot.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 13-18 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Mumick et al. (US 6983307 B2).

Since claims 1-9, 13-18 and 22-24 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 1-9, 13-18 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is moot.

Applicant respectfully contends that Mumick does not anticipate claim 25, because Mumick does not teach each and every feature of claim 25. For example, Mumick does not teach the feature: "receiving the identifier from a second browser".

As a first example of why Mumick does not anticipate claim 25, Mumick does not teach the feature: "receiving a request for an identifier from a first browser; dynamically generating an identifier in response to the received request".

The Examiner argues that the Mumick's event record 406 represents the claimed identifier, presumably because the event record 406 identifies events generated on browser 110 (see Mumick, col. 8, line 62 - col. 9, line 16).

The Examiner also argues that Mumick, col. 9, lines 38-39 teaches the claimed feature of "receiving a request for an identifier from a first browser". Noting that Mumick, col. 9, lines 38-39 recites that "browser 110 may send event record 406 to browser 114", Applicants interpret the Examiner's argument as including an allegation that the claimed "request" is a request by the second browser 114 from the first browser 110 for the event record 406, which Applicant respectfully disagrees with because the fact that browser 110 may send event record 406 to browser 114 does not inherently disclose that browser 114 requests the event record 406 from

browser 110. Therefore, Mumick does not teach the preceding feature of claim 25.

Moreover, the preceding argument by the Examiner indicates that the Examiner considers Mumick's browser 110 to represent the claimed first browser and Mumick's browser 114 to represent the claimed second browser.

However, Mumick does not teach that the identifier (i.e., event record 406) is dynamically generated in response to the received request (i.e., in response to the request by browser 114 for the event record 406), as required by the preceding feature of claim 25. Rather, Mumick teaches that event record 406 is generated (by execution of the script engine 402) "in response to the occurrence of the events" (Mumick, col. 8, lines 65-67) generated on browser 110 (see Mumick, col. 8, line 65 - col. 9, line 16).

Therefore, Mumick does not teach the preceding feature of claim 25.

As a second example of why Mumick does not anticipate claim 25, Mummick does not teach the feature: "receiving the identifier from a second browser".

The Examiner argues: "Mumick discloses ... receiving the identifier from a second browser *(Column 9 lines 38-40: first browser sends event record to second browser)*".

In response as explained *supra*, the Examiner has argued that Mumick's browser 110 represents the claimed first browser and Mumick's browser 114 represents the claimed second browser. However, Mumick, col. 9, lines 38-39 states that the first browser 110 may send the identifier (i.e., event record 406) to second browser 114. Therefore, the identifier (i.e., event record 406) is received from the first browser 110, and is not received from the second browser 114 as required by the language of claim 25.

Therefore, Mumick does not teach the preceding feature of claim 25.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully maintains that Mumick does not anticipate claim 25, and that claim 25 is in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 10-11 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mumick et al. (US 6983307 B2) in view of Masse et al. (US 5596721).

Since claims 10-11 and 19-20 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 10-11 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mumick et al. (US 6983307 B2) in view of Balasuriya (US 2003/0140113 A1).

Since claims 12 and 21 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 12 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is moot.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully believes that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM).

Date: __11/02/2007__

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive - Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
Telephone (518) 220-1850
Facsimile (518) 220-1857
E-mail: jfriedman@iplawusa.com